REMARKS

Claims 22-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1-22, 26, 36 and 37 have been canceled. New claims 45-53 have been added with new claims 45, 48 and 51 replacing claims 22, 36 and 37. New claims 45-53 are supported by at least paragraphs [0173] to [0188] of the published application. Accordingly, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

<u>The Examiner's Response to Arguments</u>

The Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" in the present Office action states that Applicant relies on the data processing apparatus "not subsequently transmitting the display control information." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant only argued in the prior Office action that in response to subsequent status requests, the status update information is <u>displayed in accordance with the stored display control information,</u> as clearly recited in claims 22, 36 and 37, and did not argue nor suggest that the display control information is not subsequently transmitted from the data processing apparatus to the client terminal.

Applicant is of the opinion that the distinguishing feature of the present invention <u>is</u> the fact that the status icons disclosed by Roosen are transmitted from the server to the client <u>each time</u> a status request is made by a client, whereas in contrast, the present invention transmits the status icons to the client only once, at which time they are stored in the client but not displayed. A selected one of the stored icons is displayed when a subsequent status request is made by the client to the data processing apparatus. Consequently, network congestion is reduced.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 22-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0036793 ("Roosen") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411 ("McCormick"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

While applicant believes that the features recited by current claims 22, 36 and 37 are not all disclosed by Roosen, Applicant has replaced claims 22, 36 and 37 with new corresponding

claims 45, 48 and 51 which more clearly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as his invention. New claim 45 recites:

45. (New) A method of controlling the display on a client terminal of a status of a data processing apparatus connected to the client terminal via a network comprising:

transmitting a first request for display control information to the data processing apparatus ;

providing the display control information to the client terminal in response to the first request and thereafter storing the display control information;

transmitting a second request for display information to the data processing apparatus based on the stored display control information;

providing the display information from the data processing apparatus to the client terminal in response to the second request, said display information comprising a plurality of icons representative of the status of the data processing apparatus, the display information being stored in the client terminal without being displayed; and

transmitting a third request to the data processing apparatus subsequent to storing the display information, wherein in response to the third status request, the data processing apparatus transmits identification data representative of the status of the data processing apparatus to the client terminal, whereupon the client terminal displays, based on the identification data, the one of the plurality of previously stored icons representative of the status of the data processing apparatus.

The Examiner points to paragraph [0109] of Roosen as disclosing the storing of display control information at the client terminal in response to a status request and using the stored display information to respond to subsequent status requests. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued Roosen.

Roosen at paragraph [0099] describes a process in which a browser B in a client computer requests web pages from a server 310. A device status frame 45 (Fig. 15) is one of several frames in a web page which is transmitted from the server in response to each request from the browser. The status frame 45 displays icons which represent the status of each printer known to the server. In paragraph [0109], Roosen describes a script included in the web page that causes the browser to request updated web frames at prescribed intervals. Thus, at the prescribed intervals, the browser transmits a status request to the server, requesting at least one new frame, for instance the device status frame 45.

As described by Roosen at paragraphs [0104] and [0109] the server creates frame 45 which "presents information on the printers of the group including their statuses." Each time a request is made to the server, the server formulates a new frame 45, including the control information for displaying the display information and updated status icons.

The method disclosed by Roosen dynamically prepares a web page containing the requested information and sends the requested web page to the requesting browser. The web server is disclosed as having a set of web pages available for different browser requests, (see paragraph [0099]). The web server is of a kind that that uses Active Server Pages (ASP.NET). Based on the foregoing, one skilled in the art would understand that each web page is generated using HTML and includes both information to be displayed and the control information for displaying the information in each frame of the web page.

It is clear that Roosen transmits updated status icons from the server to the client each time status is requested by the client. The updated icons displayed by the client, i.e. those displayed in frame 45, are the icons transmitted from the server in response to each status request.

Roosen teaches that updated status icons displayed by a client computer in frame 45 originate in the frame 45 transmitted from the server each time a status request is responded to by the server. Nowhere does Roosen teach or suggest that: (1) icons representing the status of a data processing apparatus and provided by the data processing apparatus to a client terminal are stored by the client terminal without being displayed, or (2) subsequent to the icons being stored

in the client terminal, the client terminal displays one of the previously stored icons representative of the data processing status in response to a status request by the client, as recited in new claim 45. McCormick does not make up for Roosen's deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 22 as it may be applied to new claim 45.

Independent claims 48 and 51 include limitations equivalent to claim 45. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 36 and 37 as it may be applied to new claims 48 and 51.

Claims 23-25, 27-35 and 38-44 depend from allowable claims 45 and 51. Accordingly, claims 23-25, 27-35 and 38-44 are allowable based at least their dependency from allowable claims 45 and 51.

New Claims 45-53

New claims 46-47, 49-50 and 52-53 depend respectively from allowable claims 45, 48 and 51. Accordingly, claims 46-47, 49-50 and 52-53 are allowable based at least their dependency from allowable claims 45, 48 and 53.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application including claims 23-25, 26-35 and 38-53 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowability of claims 23-25, 26-35 and 38-53 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENGO OCHI

February 1, 2010   By:

(Date)

LOUIS SICKLES, II
Registration No. 45,803
PANITCH SCHWARZE BELISARIO & NADEL LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street - Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Direct Dial: (215) 965-1294

LS/msm